1	ALLISON M. BROWN (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>)		
2	alli.brown@kirkland.com JESSICA DAVIDSON (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) jessica.davidson@kirkland.com CHRISTOPHER D. COX (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) christopher.cox@kirkland.com		
3			
4			
5	KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP 601 Lexington Avenue		
6	New York, NY 10022 Telephone: (212) 446-4800		
7	MICHAEL B. SHORTNACY (SBN: 277035)		
8	mshortnacy@shb.com SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.		
9	2121 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400		
10	Los Angeles, CA 90067 Telephone: (424) 285-8330		
11	PATRICK OOT (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) oot@shb.com SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P. 1800 K St. NW Ste. 1000 Washington, DC 20006		
12			
13			
14	Telephone: (202) 783-8400		
15	Attorneys for Defendants UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; RASIER, LLC; and RASIER-CA, LLC		
16			
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
18	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
19	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
20			
21	IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT	Case No. 3:23-md-03084-CRB	
22	LITIGATION	DEFENDANTS UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., RASIER, LLC, AND RASIER-CA, LLC'S MOTION TO CONVERT ORDER OF	
23		DISMISSAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE	
24	This Document Relates to:	Date: February 20, 2026	
25	Time Boomism results to.	Time: 10:00 a.m. Courtroom: 6 – 17th Floor	
26			
27			
28	DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO CONVERT ORDER OF DISMISS A		

CASE NO. 3:23-MD-3084-CRB

WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE

1	Jane Doe LN v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-00120-CRB	
2	Jane Doe TW v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-00559-CRB	
3		
4	Jane Doe BW v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-04308-CRB	
5	Jane Doe ST v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-04309-CRB	
6		
7	Jane Doe AR v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-04313-CRB	
8	Jane Doe VB v. Uber Technologies, Inc.,	
9	et al., No. 3:24-cv-04317-CRB	
10	Jane Doe KH v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-04326-CRB	
11	Jane Doe SF v. Uber Technologies, Inc.,	
12	et al., No. 3:24-cv-04327-CRB	
13	Jane Doe SG v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-04353-CRB	
4	Jane Doe TW v. Uber Technologies, Inc.,	
15	et al., No. 3:24-cv-04356-CRB	
16	Jane Doe SW v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-04364-CRB	
17	Jane Doe JG v. Uber Technologies, Inc.,	
18	et al., No. 3:24-cv-04368-CRB	
19	Jane Doe PC v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-04374-CRB	
20	WHB 1478 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et	
21	al., No. 3:24-cv-04833-CRB	
22	WHB 1123 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-04850-CRB	
23	WHB 1144 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et	
24	al., No. 3:24-cv-04859-CRB	
25	WHB 196 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-04886-CRB	
26	WHB 526 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et	
27	al., No. 3:24-cv-04901-CRB	
_ /	1	

1	WHB 950 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-04931-CRB
2	WHB 1936 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-04950-CRB
3	WHB 175 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et
4	al., No. 3:24-cv-04982-CRB
5	WHB 1916 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05003-CRB
6	
7	WHB 1845 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05015-CRB
8	Jane Doe (C.A.) v. Uber Technologies,
9	Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05072-CRB
10	Jane Doe RD v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05074-CRB
11	Jane Doe JH v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05079-CRB
12	
13	WHB 979 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05082-CRB
14	WHB 649 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05095-CRB
15	Jane Doe EB v. Uber Technologies, Inc.,
16	et al., No. 3:24-cv-05110-CRB
17	Jane Doe AE v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05121-CRB
18	
19	WHB 1425 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05129-CRB
20	WHB 427 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et
21	al., No. 3:24-cv-05132-CRB
22	John Doe DG v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05169-CRB
23	Jane Doe KH v. Uber Technologies, Inc.,
24	et al., No. 3:24-cv-05174-CRB
25	WHB 1382 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05232-CRB
26	WHB 1962 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et
27	al., No. 3:24-cv-05240-CRB

1	WHB 1549 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05275-CRB
2	WHB 1048 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05462-CRB
3	WHB 1443 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et
4	al., No. 3:24-cv-05472-CRB
5	WHB 1596 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05473-CRB
67	WHB 1673 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05552-CRB
8	WHB 519 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05627-CRB
10	WHB 393 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05633-CRB
11 12	WHB 1416 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05667-CRB
13	Jane Doe SK v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05710-CRB
14 15	Jane Doe AM v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05765-CRB
16	Jane Doe CS v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-05964-CRB
17 18	Jane Doe GT v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-06051-CRB
19	John Doe EW v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-06073-CRB
20	Jane Doe JD v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-06074-CRB
21 22	Jane Doe NLG JV v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:24-cv-08622-CRB
23	Jane Doe NLG KC v. Uber
24	Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-00072-CRB
25	Jane Doe NLG TT v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-00075-CRB
26	Inc., et at., No. 3.23-CV-000/3-CND

1	Jane Doe NLG PO v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv- 00358-CRB
2	
3	Jane Doe NLG LB v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-00365-CRB
4	Jane Doe NLG BH v. Uber
5	Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-00369-CRB
6	Jane Doe NLG BE v. Uber Technologies,
7	Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-00401-CRB
8	Jane Doe NLG KK v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv- 00673-CRB
9	
10	Jane Doe NLG JN v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-00715-CRB
11	WHB 2045 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-01211-CRB
12	
13	WHB 2052 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-01229-CRB
14	Jane Doe NLG KL v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-01265-CRB
15	Jane Doe NLG AH v. Uber
16	Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-
17	01266-CRB
18	Jane Doe NLG- ZD v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-
19	01729-CRB
20	Jane Doe NLG- WB v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-
21	01799-CRB
22	Jane Doe NLG- JN v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-
23	01818-CRB
24	Jane Doe 691046 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-02274-CRB
25	Jane Doe NLG-KM v. Uber
26	Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-02706-CRB
27	

DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO CONVERT ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE

Page 6 of 10

CASE NO. 3:23-MD-3084-CRB

2

3

45

67

8

10

12

11

13 14

15

16

17

Dated: January 15, 2026

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

26

27

28

<u>WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE</u>

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on February 20, 2026 at 10:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard, before the Honorable Charles R. Breyer, in Courtroom No. 6, on the 17th Floor of the San Francisco Courthouse for the above-entitled Court, located at 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, Defendants Uber Technologies, Inc., Rasier, LLC, and Rasier-CA, LLC (collectively, "Uber") will, and hereby do, move for the Court to convert its Order of Dismissal Without Prejudice (ECF 4442) to an order of dismissal with prejudice for the above-listed Plaintiffs.

This Motion is made pursuant to Amended Pretrial Order No. 10 (ECF 4287) and Rules 16(f)(1)(C), 37(b)(2)(A)(v), and 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. This Motion is based on this Notice; the concurrently filed Declaration of Michael B. Shortnacy; the concurrently filed Proposed Order; all evidence, pleadings, and papers filed herewith; the entire file in this coordinated action; any Reply that may be filed in support of this Motion; and any other arguments or evidence that may be presented to the Court in support of this Motion.

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.

By: /s/ Michael B. Shortnacy

MICHAEL B. SHORTNACY (SBN: 277035)

mshortnacy@shb.com

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.

2121 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400 Los Angeles, CA 90067

Telephone: (424) 285-8330 Facsimile: (424) 204-9093

DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO CONVERT ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE STATEMENT OF RELIEF SOUGHT

Pursuant to the Court's November 3, 2025 Amended PTO 10, Uber seeks for the Court to convert its Order of Dismissal Without Prejudice (ECF 4442) to an order of dismissal with prejudice for the above-referenced Plaintiffs for failure to comply with this Court's order to submit verifications for their most recent amended Plaintiff Fact Sheet ("PFS").

BACKGROUND

On November 19, 2025 this Court entered an Order (ECF 4442) dismissing without prejudice the claims of certain plaintiffs who had failed to comply with Amended PTO 10 (ECF 4287) by providing verifications for their amended PFS, as required. That Order further required Plaintiffs' counsel to file notices of dismissal of the identified cases within 14 days. ECF 4442. Upon entry of the Court's Order, Plaintiffs had 30 days to either (1) submit the verifications required under Amended PTO 10, or (2) move to vacate their dismissal without prejudice. Amend. PTO 10 ¶9(c). If Plaintiffs failed to do either, the Court stated in its Order (ECF 4287) that it would convert their dismissals without prejudice to dismissals with prejudice upon a motion by Uber. *Id*.

Exhibit A to the accompanying declaration of Michael B. Shortnacy identifies the Plaintiffs subject to the Court's November 19, 2025 Order who failed to either (1) submit the required verifications, or (2) move to vacate the dismissal without prejudice. *See* Declaration of Michael B. Shortnacy ("Shortnacy Decl."), dated January 15, 2026 (Ex. B). Of the Plaintiffs identified in Exhibit A, five were dismissed without prejudice prior to the Court's November 19, 2025 Order. *Id.*¹ Three other Plaintiffs failed to file a notice of dismissal as required by that same order. *Id.*² Accordingly, all Plaintiffs identified in Exhibit A are subject to conversion of their Order of dismissal without prejudice to dismissal with prejudice pursuant to Amended PTO 10.

05961-CRB; WHB 1317, No. 3:24-cv-05791-CRB; and WHB 2055, No. 3:25-cv-01245-CRB.

WHB 304, No. 3:24-cv-04801-CRB; WHB 1860, No. 3:24-cv-05568-CRB; WHB 678, No. 3:24-cv-

² Jane Doe NLG-JN, No. 3:25-cv-01818-CRB; Jane Doe NLG-KM, No. 3:25-cv-02856-CRB; and Jane Doe NLG-KM, No. 3:25-cv-02956-CRB.

2

3

5

6

4

7 8

9 10

1112

13

1415

16

17

18

1920

21

22

23

24

25

2627

28

ARGUMENT

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) empowers a court to dismiss a plaintiff's case for failure to comply with a court order. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(b)(2) likewise provides a court with the authority to dismiss an action for failure "to obey an order to provide or permit discovery." Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(b)(2)(A)(v); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(f)(1)(C) ("On motion or on its own, the court may issue any just orders, including those authorized by Rule 37(b)(2)(A)(ii)-(vii), if a party or its attorney . . . fails to obey a scheduling or other pretrial order."). Pursuant to both Rule 41(b) and Rule 37(b)(2), dismissal with prejudice of Plaintiffs' claims is justified here.

The Court should dismiss these Plaintiffs with prejudice pursuant to its power to manage its dockets "without being subject to endless non-compliance with case management orders," which is amplified in the MDL context. See In re Phenylproanolamine (PPA) Prods. Liab. Litig., 406 F.3d 1217, 1227 (9th Cir. 2006). As the Ninth Circuit observed, "an MDL court's decision to invoke dismissal as a sanction for failure to comply with its orders, the court's discretion is necessarily informed, and broadened, by the number of actions, their complexity, and its charge in the multidistrict context to promote the just and efficient conduct of actions that are coordinated or consolidated for pretrial purposes." *Id.* at 1252. Thus, dismissal with prejudice for failure to submit the information for substantial completion of a PFS—including a verification—as required by an MDL court order is common practice. See, e.g., In re Testosterone Replacement Therapy Prods. Liab. Litig., MDL 2545, CMO No. 118, ECF 2612 (N.D. Ill. May 11, 2018) ("The failure of these plaintiffs to comply with the PPF [Plaintiff Profile Form] requirements of CMO 85 amounts to an unjustified failure to produce discovery following entry of a court order. The failure to produce discovery is prejudicial to the defendants in these cases because it hinders the investigation and preparation of a defense in these cases. For those reasons, the Court finds it appropriate to dismiss with prejudice all such cases."); In re General Motors LLC Ignition Switch Litig., 14-MD-2543, Order No. 56, ECF 985 (S.D.N.Y. May 27, 2015) ("[T]he Court find that dismissal with prejudice is the appropriate sanction for the individuals Plaintiffs' continued failure to submit PFSs as required by Order No. 25 . . . [T]imely submission of PFSs is essential to the orderly and expeditious management of this MDL, and crucial

in ensuring that [Defendant] has adequate notice of the claims against it."); In re PPA Prods. Liab. Litig., 01-MD-1407, Order Granting Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice, ECF 1935 (W.D. Wa. Aug. 15, 2003) ("[T]he unreasonable delay in completing the fact sheets and affirmations prejudices the Defendants' ability to proceed with the cases effectively. The PFS and affirmations are designed to give each defendant the specific information necessary to defend the case against it . . . The unreasonable delay in producing this information, therefore, severely prejudices the Defendants, warranting dismissal."); In re Taxotere (Docetaxel) Prods. Liab. Litig. (In re Taxotere), 966 F.3d 351, 354 (5th Cir. 2020) (affirming dismissal with prejudice for late and incomplete PFS); In re Guidant, 496 F.3d at 865-66 (same); In re Mirena IUD Prods. Liab. Litig., No. 13-MD-2434, 2015 WL 10433457, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 5, 2015) (dismissing with prejudice for PFS deficiencies); In re Zicam Cold Remedy Mktg., Sales Pracs., & Prods. Liab. Litig., No. 09-md-2096, 2011 WL 3438862, at *2 & n.1 (D. Ariz. Aug. 5, 2011) (same); In re Rezulin Prods. Liab. Litig. (MDL No. 1348), 223 F.R.D. 109, 113, 120 (S.D.N.Y. 2004) (same), vacated in part, 2004 WL 1700618, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. July 27, 2004) (denying reconsideration as to plaintiffs whose cases were dismissed for failure to provide proof of timely and complete discovery). **CONCLUSION** Accordingly, pursuant to Amended PTO 10 (ECF 4287) and the Court's November 19, 2025 Order (ECF 4442), Uber respectfully requests the Court enter an order converting its Order of dismissal of the identified Plaintiffs' claims to an Order of dismissal with prejudice. Dated: January 15, 2026 By: /s/ Michael B. Shortnacy mshortnacy@shb.com

20

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.

22

23

24

25

26

27

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

MICHAEL B. SHORTNACY (SBN: 277035)

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.

2121 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400

Los Angeles, CA 90067

Telephone: (424) 285-8330 Facsimile: (424) 204-9093 Attorney for Defendants

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

RASIER, LLC, and RASIER-CA, LLC